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The greatest improvement in productive powers of labour, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity, and judgment with which it is anywhere directed, or applied, seems to have been the effects of the division of labour.

(SMITH, 1776)

Organization as a way of coordination requires the establishment of a system of authority whereby the central purpose or objective of the enterprise is translated into reality through the combined efforts of many specialists, each working in his own field at a particular time and place. It is clear from long experience in human affairs that such a structure requires not only many men at work in many places at selected times, but also a single directing executive authority. The problem of the organization thus becomes the problem of building up between the executive at the center and the sub-division of work on the periphery an effective network of communications and control. It is the function of this organization to enable the director to coordinate and energize all of the sub-divisions so that the major objective may be achieved efficiently.

(GULICK, 1937)

The hierarchy of positions, with graduation of honors and privileges, which is the universal accompaniment of all complex organizations, is essential to the adjustment of non-material incentives to induce the services of the most able individuals or the most valuable potential contributors to organization, and it is likewise necessary to the maintenance of pride of organization, community sense, etc., which are important general incentives to all classes of contributors.

(BARNARD, 1938)

OVERVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Organizations also have a formal structure and an informal structure, a phenomenon that was recognized by Chester Barnard in the 1930s: “Formal organizations arise out of and are necessary to informal organizations; but when they come into operation; they create and require informal organizations” (1938). This book examines the forces that impact criminal justice organizations and nurture the informal side of those organizations. It is important, therefore, to review the formal structure of organizations here to set the stage for the following chapters. This chapter closely examines the basic structures and dimensions of organizations and describes the logic of various structural configurations that can be implemented by agencies. In addition, the chapter reviews the basic concepts of organizational mission, policies, procedures, and practices and briefly introduces the informal side of organizations. Throughout the chapter, we apply the concepts of organizational structure to criminal justice agencies. The structure of an organization provides a framework within which its members carry out their prescribed activities.
that, collectively, will cause the organization to achieve its purpose. The framework is composed of the organization’s mission, policies, and procedures, and a hierarchy of authority to direct members in the pursuit of its purpose. The formal structure creates formal roles and relationships, divides labor and allocates responsibility, and promotes rules and a hierarchy of authority to coordinate activities (Bolman and Deal, 2003).

Criminal justice organizations vary greatly in their size and structure. The vast majority of these agencies in the United States are relatively small and serve suburban and rural communities. For example, 71 percent of jails in the United States are relatively small, housing fewer than 150 inmates or less. At the other extreme, about 9 percent of the nation’s jails house almost half of jail inmates (National Institute of Justice [NIJ], 2001:3). The largest jails are New York City’s Riker’s Island, Chicago’s Cook County Jail, Los Angeles County’s multiple complexes, and Houston’s Harris County Jail (NIJ, 2001). Adult correctional systems obviously vary greatly in size. The Federal Bureau of Prisons manages a prison system that extends across the country. Within systems, institutions vary dramatically in size. In Michigan, for example, the prison system comprises one prison, constructed in the 1880s, which houses more than 6,000 inmates, along with institutions with population capacities of 500 or less and a number of camps that hold less than 100 inmates.

Law enforcement agencies across the nation also vary dramatically in size and scope of mission. In 2003, a number of federal agencies were placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Homeland Security. The Department of Homeland Security now has authority over the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), U. S. Customs and Border Protection, U. S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the U. S. Secret Service. Homeland Security also subsumes authority over 10 other federal agencies—such as Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)—that are not specifically law enforcement agencies. The U. S. Department of Justice includes 59 federal agencies, eight of which are law enforcement specific and include the Office of Attorney General, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal Bureau of Prisons, U. S. Drug Enforcement Administration, the U. S. Marshals Service, Interpol, and U. S. National Central Bureau. The Department of the Interior, whose mission is to protect the nation’s natural resources, has authority over the Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and the U. S. Park Police. Most law enforcement agencies, however, fall within state and local jurisdictions. “Big city” police departments are, by the nature of their jurisdictions, comparatively large. For example, the New York City Police Department has more than 44,000 employees, with the majority, more than 36,000, sworn law enforcement officers. At the other extreme are 13,580 municipal police departments and 3,100 sheriff’s departments. Many small agencies have just one full-time sworn police officer or are composed solely of part-time officers (Schmalleger, 2001).

Given the diversity in size and scope of criminal justice agencies across the country, it is not possible to describe an organizational structure generic to all
or even most organizations. A few key dimensions, however, are common to almost all organizations, regardless of size or structure. This chapter will provide a general description of those organizational dimensions and show how they operate in criminal justice agencies. The discussion will begin with a general description of two distinct models of organizations: mechanistic organizations, commonly referred to as bureaucratic, formal, or hierarchical systems, and organic organizations, alternately referred to as professional, or informal systems. Mechanistic organizations are typically rigid, based upon strict rules and downward communication. Organic organizations have flexible networks of professional staff who may perform a variety of tasks (Kinicki and Kreitner, 2006). Henry (2006) provides a sound sketch and comparison of both these models.

Mechanistic organizations—bureaucracies—are predicated on stable environmental conditions that create routine demands for services. In this type of organization, therefore, tasks tend to be specialized and divided among the labor force—that is, each member has a narrow range of duties that contributes to the agency’s overall mission. Means or processes are emphasized over outcomes. It is assumed that if all workers perform their tasks correctly, the final product will result naturally. Every job is spelled out clearly in a formal job description that also dictates and limits the amount of authority and responsibility each individual has. Bureaucracies tend to be hierarchical, having a chain of command delegating authority and responsibility from the central authority downward (see Figure 2.1). Communications, power authority relationships, and loyalty are expected to flow vertically between superiors and subordinates. Bosses legitimately give orders, and subordinates obey. However, power is constrained by the organization’s reliance on written rules and regulations that delimit authority and responsibility. Knowledge and expertise are assumed to exist at the top of bureaucratic organizations. Therefore, planning, conflict resolution, and decision making in general are primarily a function of top-level supervisors. Promotion of personnel to higher levels of authority and
responsibility within bureaucratic organizations is based on their years of service and an assessment, usually subjective, about their capabilities. It is assumed that knowledge and expertise accumulate with longevity of career service.

Large metropolitan law enforcement agencies—often referred to metaphorically as “big city policing”—and state and federal correctional and law enforcement agencies are examples of criminal justice agencies structured along bureaucratic lines. It is common for large agencies, while adhering to a bureaucratic structure, to decentralize their operations by creating field offices or, in the case of large metropolitan police agencies, command districts. Interestingly, law enforcement and corrections agencies are often categorized as paramilitary organizations because a rigid chain of command exists; subordinates are trained to “follow orders”; and members are uniformed, armed, and authorized to apply coercive force in carrying out their duties.

Bureaucratic systems emphasize means rather than results. In evaluating individuals or agency effectiveness and in supervising personnel, supervisors focus on the expected activities and routines of agency personnel (the means of production) rather than what they produce. For example, corrections officers are expected to make rounds on a predetermined time schedule; doing this, it is assumed, will ensure supervision and control of inmates. In fact, some jails require corrections officers to punch cards at time clocks located at the end of each cell block to ensure they patrol the cell blocks at designated times. Similarly, law enforcement officers assigned to traffic control may be judged on the number of violation tickets they give out during a particular period. Police agencies commonly check starting and ending mileage on patrol cars to ensure that patrol officers are patrolling their assigned sections.

This emphasis on means rather than on the goals or ends explains why the criminal judicial system is often accused of delivering assembly line justice (Paker 1968) as prosecutors plea bargain cases so that courts can eliminate or keep up with backlogs, without considering the effects or results of these processes or practices. The need for efficiency has also resulted in simplifying sentencing decisions with legislated sentencing guidelines that judges are required to follow. The elimination of discretion and simplification of the decision-making process with the emphasis on the means or process has been referred to as the “McDonaldization” of the criminal justice system (Bohm, 2006). A systematic method of measuring the effects of random patrols or plea bargaining on agency goals and objectives is rarely pursued.

The hierarchical structure of a bureaucracy forces official communication to occur vertically. Commands and policy directives emanate from the top and are sent downward through the chain of command; information and reports on the activities of subordinates or problems within the organization are sent upward to appropriate levels. Because it is assumed that expertise and knowledge reside at the top of a bureaucratic agency, major policy and operational decisions tend to be made at this level. In the hierarchical structure, it follows logically that clear superior–subordinate relationships exist among personnel. The management style is, therefore, directed toward command and obedience. Loyalty toward the organization and supervisors is generally expected from subordinates.
Professional or organic agencies are the extreme opposite of bureaucracies. Such organizations are ideally suited to function within unstable environments that demand outcomes requiring nonroutine tasks. In this type of organization, tasks are not specialized and any member of the agency may have the expertise or knowledge to take on a variety of tasks. Tasks may also be assumed by groups or teams sharing expertise. Because tasks are not specialized and responsibility is not constrained by written procedures, rules, and regulations, ends are emphasized over means. Decision making—conflict resolution, planning, policy development, and the like—is mostly a result of structured and informal interaction between personnel rather than a prerogative reserved for executive or top managers. Decision making can emanate from groups or any individual because knowledge and expertise are assumed to be possessed by all personnel, at least within each individual’s specific task area.

In organic agencies, interactions tend to be horizontal rather than vertical, through a chain of command, as prescribed for a bureaucratic agency. Leadership relationships tend to be peer-oriented rather than superior–subordinate. Advice and coaching, therefore, replace commands. Thinking about organizations as open systems leads to understanding the importance of the environmental demands and an agency’s willingness and ability to be responsive to community needs. Organic agencies within the criminal judicial system include small prosecuting attorneys’ offices, law enforcement departments, and jails commanding less than 10 professional personnel. Research or planning departments within agencies will also likely organize as organic systems, taking on an informal organizational structure.

It is unlikely that any one agency is purely bureaucratic or organic; both structures are advantageous for different tasks or missions. This is apparent in large bureaucratic agencies that develop organic units within their structures to meet demands and perform tasks not suited to a mechanistic approach.

Here the traditional conflict between prison treatment and custody staff provides a common example. A great deal has been written about this phenomenon. Generally, the conflict is viewed as a philosophical or operational conflict. What also must be considered is that custody personnel work under a bureaucratic or paramilitaristic system of management, whereas treatment staff—psychologists, social workers, and counselors—have a great deal more discretion because they work in an organic or professional subsystem of the prison. The differing degrees of autonomy and discretion among the groups also create conflict, especially as it relates to enforcement of inmate rules and regulations. The conflict stems from role and work culture differences. However, the major basis of conflict is the gravitational pull the dominant and traditional bureaucratic structure has on the professional organization of the treatment staff. The problem exists in traditional law enforcement agencies that attempt to develop community policing units with the traditional bureaucratic structure and chain of command. Failure to alter organizational structure to fit the professionalism of community policing leads to the failure to implement a true community police operation (Geva and Shem-Tov, 2002; Williams, 2003).
Conversely, professional or organic organizations, such as universities, also have chain of command, job descriptions for staff, and many other characteristics of a bureaucratic agency. A close look will show that even the academic side of universities tends to form as organic from the bottom up and bureaucratic from the top down. Moreover, small agencies, such as small-town law enforcement agencies or jails in smaller jurisdictions, will function along the lines of an organic agency. Lines of authority tend to be weak, and decision making often evolves from consensus building. However, some degree of authoritative command exists even in small agencies. Team policing is likewise an attempt to remove a unit of law enforcement officers from the restrictions of the agency’s hierarchy and structure to allow officers the freedom to work as a professional problem solving unit (Shanahan, 1985).

Courts are generally depicted as organic systems. Defense attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, and judges work together as semiautonomous agents guided by formal procedural rules, a code of ethics, and informal rules of conduct (Neubauer, 1983). This is an easy conclusion to draw if we understand courts from the perspective of the courtroom: the judge, prosecutor, and defense attorney engage in an adversarial relationship controlled by judges and serviced by lawyers. More often, proceedings take place outside the court in a negotiation process. All participants are highly paid, well-educated, trained professionals, and bureaucratic organization is not immediately visible. However, the criminal judicial process also includes courtroom personnel, including the bailiff and court stenographer; the clerk of courts office, which is the records and information management arm of the court; the prosecutor’s office; and the adult probation department. In larger jurisdictions, the clerk of courts, prosecutor’s office, and probation department begin to develop a hierarchy, attempting to “specialize” tasks, make rules and regulations, and create other bureaucratic mechanisms in an attempt to control and regulate the flow of work. In fact, large courts will add a court administrator to their system to coordinate and regulate the flow of work across all units of the court system.

In the first section, we provided the reader with a general description of bureaucratic and organic structures. In this section, we will examine the elements of structure and the logic of their development in more detail. Organizations have in common a number of structural dimensions that determine the extent to which a bureaucratic or organic structure develops. These dimensions are task specialization, formalization, span of control, centralization versus decentralization, complexity, and the allocation of personnel in line versus staff positions (Baron and Greenberg, 1990).

Task specialization is the process of dividing the work process into a number of smaller tasks. It can be high or nonexistent, depending upon an agency’s size and the divisibility of the work process. High levels of task specialization suggest that each person or subunit performs a very narrow range of activities, as in an auto plant assembly line. Low task specialization implies that employees or subunits perform a wide range of tasks. Criminal justice agencies feature both high and low task specialization. Corrections officers may be given specialized assignments that include supervising intake and receiving, recreational facilities, or the
infamous “yard.” Each assignment requires a unique and specialized array of knowledge and expertise. Yet each assignment also requires both knowledge of the overall prison operations and a rather wide range of human relations and communications skills to carry out the task.

Police agencies also divide tasks by related function. For example, a large law enforcement agency has units to deal with computer crimes, homicide, burglary, drugs, gangs, traffic, and a multitude of other tasks. Currently, homeland security or counterterrorism units have been implemented in police agencies. Each officer, however, will be expected to respond to a broad array of situations during the course of his or her duty. Small criminal justice agencies do not have enough personnel or a sufficiently complex workload to be concerned with high, often excessive, specialization. It is not uncommon for one or two individuals to be responsible for everything from booking prisoners to responding to service calls.

Formalization consists of the establishment of rules and regulations, usually written, that govern the work activities of an agency’s personnel. Rules and regulations are often considered or identified as policies and procedures. An agency with a high degree of formalization will have rules governing almost every aspect of the work process, and the expected work behaviors of the organization’s members will be spelled out in great detail. High levels of formalization reduce uncertainty and clearly define authority, responsibility, and decision-making procedures in most situations. Research suggests that formalization has a significant positive impact on correctional officers’ job satisfaction and commitment to the organization (Lambert, Paoline, and Hogan, 2006).

Prisons typically have pages of written rules and regulations. Prison personnel face written regulations on issues ranging from employee parking to the amount of force that can be used on inmates. In spite of claims of professionalism, law enforcement personnel also often face a high degree of formalization. A case in point is the midsize law enforcement agency claiming to be professional and progressive that was in the habit of disciplining officers for being out of their cars without wearing their caps.

The judicial process is also governed by a number of written rules and procedures. Colleges and law schools offer classes in criminal procedures that describe in detail the rules and regulations that govern the criminal side of courts. Agencies with low levels of formalization rely on the expertise of staff rather than rules and regulations to direct work activities. Subordinates are allowed a great deal of latitude and authority in decision making. Typically, more “professional” organizations, in which tasks demand a high level of expertise from subordinates, require low levels of formalization. The prosecutor’s office, while bound by legal procedures in formal court hearings, rarely has written rules on selecting cases, charging, and plea bargaining. Instead, judgments are guided by prosecutors’ experience and expertise in analyzing individual cases.

The span of control—the number of subordinates reporting to a supervisor—is another significant dimension of organizational structure. (The number of individuals reporting to one supervisor is often referred to as the scaler principle.) A wide span of control implies that a large number of subordinates report to one supervisor. Conversely, a narrow span of control suggests that a small number
of subordinates report to one supervisor. Deciding if the span of control should be wide or narrow depends upon the size of the organization, the task at hand, and the skills of subordinates. For example, a shift sergeant may have 10 to 20 street patrol officers under his or her supervision, constituting a wide span of control. This may be appropriate if patrol officers know what is expected of them, have the skills to carry out their tasks, and need little supervision or coaching. In the same law enforcement agency, the shift lieutenant may supervise only five sergeants, who in turn are supervising 20 patrol officers. This narrow span of control may exist in part as an artificial artifact of the way the agency has set up five districts, each with 20 patrol officers. If, in this example, the complement of sergeants was doubled to improve supervision over patrol officers, the span of control under the sergeants would have been narrowed while the span of control under the lieutenant would have been widened.

Organizations described as having tall hierarchies contain a relatively high number of supervision levels. A tall hierarchy is generally found in organizations that utilize a narrow span of control, which is employed to provide intense supervision over subordinates. This suggests a work situation in which staff lacks competence to carry out the work without supervision or requires a great deal of coordination imposed from above. Organizations with flat hierarchies have few levels of command and typically exhibit wide spans of control at most levels. Figure 2.2 contrasts a tall organization with a narrow span of control with an organization with a wide span of control.

Decision making in organizations may be centralized or decentralized. Decision making is centralized to the extent that decisions on personnel actions, planning, formulation of policies and procedures, adjudication of conflict, and other significant issues are made by managers at the top of the hierarchy. Decision making is decentralized if decisions on significant issues occur with routine frequency throughout an agency or by staff at the grassroots level. The extent to which decision making is centralized or decentralized depends upon the organization’s basic values and management philosophy as well as on rationally constructed decision-making processes. Observers of bureaucracies view centralized decision making as a natural state resulting from a basic organizational belief that top managers have the expertise and system-wide vision to make the most effective decisions (Baron and Greenberg, 1990). A warden of a correctional institution, for example, is usually a career civil servant who has been promoted based upon professional merit, skill, and time employed, all characteristics typical of top-level public administrators. The warden is viewed as having greater decision-making skills than subordinates as a consequence of coming up through the ranks and serving at a variety of posts along his or her career.

However, the warden in his or her wisdom may decentralize the decision-making process for a number of reasons. First, the warden may believe that participation in decisions creates commitment in subordinates. Also, taking into account the limited knowledge a top manager may have about all components of the agency individually or synergistically, the warden may believe that the work or goals of each component are complex and dynamic and will, therefore, institute a decentralized decision-making process. Federal law enforcement
agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation have a common set of policies and procedures and recruit, train, and assign personnel to field offices from its central office. Decision making on aspects of case management, however, are decentralized to the field offices.

Organizations are considered simple or complex depending on the number of levels in the chain of command—vertical complexity—or the number of existing divisions or subunits across the organization—horizontal complexity. Large organizations with a number of functions are both vertically and horizontally complex. A big city police department usually has a tall hierarchy with a number of layers between the chief and line staff. The department is horizontally complex if tasks
are divided or specialized and task sets are assigned to individual units. A large police department, for example, has a homicide investigation unit, a burglary unit, and traffic control coupled with parking enforcement, drug enforcement, lockup, and a number of units too numerous to mention here. Conversely, small police departments may have a chief and a number of officers and thus almost no hierarchy. Also, all their officers perform a wide range of tasks and perform traffic safety, drug enforcement, crime prevention, and investigative and other functions during the course of a shift. Thus, small police departments tend to be simple organizations, vertically and horizontally.

Organizations of any size have both line and staff personnel. Line personnel are those individuals directly responsible for production or the delivery of services. Staff personnel are support staff that assist and/or serve line personnel in their performance. Line personnel can be found in the chain of command of an organization’s hierarchy. Staff personnel have slots in the hierarchy but do not have command authority over staff personnel. Large agencies have proportionally more staff personnel than smaller, less complex agencies. The California Correctional Peace Officers Association (CCPOA), a union that serves California correctional officers, employs a number of lawyers on its payroll as staff personnel to provide legal support. The president, vice president, and regional representatives of CCPOA, by contrast, are line personnel. Other examples of staff personnel in organizations are accountants, secretaries, mechanics, and trainers, to name a few. Moreover, large prisons may hire psychologists (staff personnel) to help correctional officers (line personnel) deal with stress-related problems. A final note: The term staff is used interchangeably and can cause confusion. Often staff is used to denote agency personnel such as the jail staff. Staff personnel refers more precisely to organizational support personnel.
SOURCE: John Andrews, Deputy Warden, Alger Maximum Correctional Facility, Michigan Department of Corrections.
MISSION, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES

The ideal bureaucracy has a written mission that is logically implemented by policies and procedures. The mission, policies, and procedures will be contained in a neatly bound policy and procedure manual. All personnel understand and accept the agency’s mission and have a general knowledge of policies as well as a working knowledge of policies and procedures that apply to their specific duties. Ideally, all personnel will carry out their tasks in accordance with their job description and applicable policies and procedures.

A mission is a statement or description of an organization’s common purpose; continuing purpose for existing responsibility to its clients or constituents; and, at least by implication, its ideology, values, and operating principles (Houston and Parsons, 2006). Walton (1986) reviews Ford Motor Company’s adoption of its “Total Quality Management” philosophy. The process, which began with a reexamination of the organization’s goals that evolved into a mission statement, took three years to complete. The mission statement emphasized the need to continually improve products to meet customers’ needs. Only through meeting these needs, it was reasoned, could the company prosper. The mission statement was followed by a statement of organizational values proclaiming that people are the source of the company’s strength, that the company would ultimately be judged by the quality of its products, and that profits would be the ultimate measure of how efficiently customers were provided with quality products. Ford’s statement was strengthened by a set of guiding principles paraphrased as follows (see Walton, 1986:136):

- Quality comes first.
- Customers are the focus of everything we do.
- Continuous improvement is essential to everything we do.
- Employment/involvement is our way of life.
- Dealers and suppliers are our partners.
- Integrity is never compromised.

Criminal justice agencies typically have written mission statements. A state department of corrections mission, for example, might read:

The mission of the Department is to incarcerate convicted felons safely; to keep inmates secure, safe from physical and psychological harm or deterioration; and to provide inmates with opportunities for a successful crime-free reentry into society while providing a safe, secure, and stress-free work environment for staff.

Ideally, the mission can provide organizational members and constituents a clear understanding of an agency’s purpose, goals, and objectives. The mission for the hypothetical corrections agency just given, for example, suggests a number of agency goals, including positive treatment and relationships of staff and inmates. In addition, the mission can direct or mold the activities of organizational members according to the organization’s stated preference for specific guiding
principles or values. Moreover, an agency’s mission statement can serve as an anchor, or direction, for all organizational activities and can keep an organization from drifting away from its original purpose. Keep in mind, however, that formal statements of organizational mission, values, and guiding principles can be written only to gather dust. Successfully implementing an organizational philosophy throughout an agency means that policies, procedures, practices, and routines supported by individual values, beliefs, and behaviors based upon the organization’s mission statement must permeate the organization.

Not all organizations have written or clearly articulated missions, but all organizations have a mission. This paradox can be understood by considering the creation of an agency’s mission. Private groups that form may charter their own mission by consensus of the members. For example, a group may come together with the purpose of housing street people, feeding the community’s poor, or forming planned activities for local teenagers. Private enterprises may organize to earn a profit, but their mission will be to provide goods or services to consumers efficiently and effectively. In other words, the mission is based upon providing a needed service or commodity. Therefore, the core of the mission—the organization’s purpose—is found in meeting the needs of groups or individuals usually external to the organization (a number of organizations, such as college fraternities or sororities, exist to meet their needs exclusively). Political scientists posit that governmental agencies, and government itself, evolve to meet social needs that presumably cannot be met effectively by the private sector (Schattschnieder, 1969).

In the ideal state, then, the purpose or mission of a public bureaucracy or a criminal justice agency is determined by the services required by society.

The mission of public bureaucracies emanates, in part, from legislation that mandates their existence and general purpose. Moreover, much of a criminal justice agency’s ideology and value structure is imposed upon it by external environmental forces. Constituents served want agencies to manifest a preferred ethos or to hold a particular ideology as well as to more narrowly define their purpose. Decisions rendered by both state and federal courts have also constrained and directed criminal justice agency missions, hence the statement in our example of a local jail’s mission—protect the constitutional rights of inmates. A key role of top administrators in public agencies is to render the general or broad mandates their agencies have received from legislation and pressures from other external sources into more narrow operational mission statements for their agencies.

Agencies, especially large bureaucracies, are not, however, helpless in the face of demands placed upon them. Rourke (1976) argues that agencies have a great deal of power with legislators and the legislative process. In effect, bureaucracies have sufficient power to influence legislation and direct their legislative mandates. Agencies are also becoming more proficient in civil litigation and protecting themselves from judicial intervention. For example, the Los Angeles County Jail System successfully litigated in the U.S. Supreme Court to overturn a federal district court order to reinstate contact visitation for inmates (see Block v. Rutherford, 104 S.Ct. 3227, 1984). The court ruled that implementing contact visitations was a penological, not a constitutional, matter. A general concern of public administration theorists is the reluctance or inability of public bureaucracies to be
responsive to the public (Denhardt, 1984; Houston and Parsons, 2006). In other words, in a less than ideal world agencies may establish their missions with limited sensitivity to public needs or demands.

Most members of an organization have a view or understanding of their organization’s purpose and values. However, members’ understanding may not necessarily be congruent with their agency’s mission statement. This is true for a number of reasons, most of which will unfold throughout this text. The pivotal point here is that the collective values, attitudes, expectations, and behaviors of an organization’s members—the true culture of an organization—also impact the organization’s mission. The culture may impact directly and formally on the mission and be reflected in the written presentation of the mission. Or, as suggested earlier, the culture may create a de facto mission that may differ substantially from the de jure, or official, mission of the organization. As a result, the purpose, structure, and activities of the organization may differ from those officially prescribed or planned. The extent to which the actual organizational purpose, structure, and activities differ from official purpose, structure, and activities is a function of several factors. Most significant to this chapter is the ability of the organization to promulgate and implement policies and procedures that are congruent with its official mission.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN ORGANIZATIONS

The link between an organization’s stated mission and the activities of its members lies in the promulgation and implementation of policies and procedures. Organizations tend to specialize tasks and create a number of subunits. Each unit of activity is directed by policies and procedures. A policy is a clear statement that defines what action is to be taken and why. A well-written policy provides a statement of purpose, action, and a rationale for the purpose. Here is an example of a policy about inmate visitation in a typical jail:

**Inmate Visitation Policy**

The Pine Mountain County Jail will provide inmates with every reasonable opportunity to visit with family members, lawyers, social workers, clergy, and other pertinent professionals.

Visitation will be limited by safety and security needs and court schedules. Inmates will not be denied visitation with legal counsel except in extreme circumstances.

**Rationale**

Visitation supports inmate morale and may alleviate much of the stress involved in being separated from families. Also, most of the inmates will be released back into the community. Visitation and contact with families and professionals will help prepare them for their release. Inmates with good morale and low stress will be more manageable and more likely to conform
to inmate rules and regulations and behave in a civil manner while incarcerated. It is especially important to provide inmates who conform to jail rules ample opportunity for family visits at the jail.

Table 2.1 shows the number of components of a jail system that must be directed by policies.

**Procedures** are step-by-step descriptions of the activities that agency members need to follow to achieve the objective or goal put forward by policy. Agency policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1 Jail Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical conditions—plumbing, lighting, bedding, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Visitation—friends, relatives, attorneys, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Correspondence—inflow and outflow; letters, packages, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Telephone calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Law library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Street clothes for court appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Religious services—church and individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Disciplinary proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Use of incorrigible cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Inmate guide—rules of behavior, lockup policies, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Classification procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intake screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Special problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. suicide threats /risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. medically ill—epileptic, diabetic, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. mentally ill/mentally impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. alcohol/drug problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Medical care—dispensing medication, doctor/dental care, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Use of force—both deadly and nondeadly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Application of leg and hand irons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Feeding—times, quantities, diet, special diets, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Showers/Cleanliness—personal and area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Detoxification cell and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Jail/Lockup personnel standards—numbers, where essential, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Preemployment issues—records/background checks, criteria for employment, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) issues, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pre-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Employee evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Employee disciplinary matters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should be directed by an agency’s mission and procedures directed by its policies. Policies also direct and define authority as well as subdivide the agency’s work into specialized areas from which specialized tasks can be derived. The following is an example of procedures directing activities to carry out the preceding policy example:

_Inmate Visitation Procedures_

1. Family visitation hours are Monday through Friday 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M., and Saturday and Sunday 9:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. Inmates will have three visits per week for 20 minutes.

2. Visitation with legal counsel, probation and parole officers, registered clergy, social service workers, and medical personnel is authorized 24 hours a day, unless extreme security and safety problems will occur concurrent with the visit (see Policy and Procedures #176–5 on managing violent inmates). The time of the visit will be determined by the visiting agent but will be reasonable in length.

3. Minimum security inmates may only have contact visits. Inmates will be pat-searched before and after contact visits. Inmates may be strip-searched after contact visit if the supervising officer has reason to believe the inmate may be attempting to smuggle contraband into the jail (see Policy and Procedures #282–7 on inmate searches).

4. Inmates with a history of violence or hostility between them, such as members of opposing gangs, may not be in the visitation area at the same time.

This list of procedures can be expanded to cover every aspect of visitation, including rotation of inmates to visits, rights of officers to deny visits, and reasons to remove visitors or otherwise conclude visits.

We can see how procedures become operational rules and regulations and further organize task specialization. The more specialized and formalized an organization becomes, the more written procedures will be promulgated to direct the activities of its personnel. In the ideal bureaucracy, the actual practices of an agency’s members—the routinized activities of the agency staff—will conform to agency policy and procedures. In the ideal bureaucracy, all staff will achieve a comprehensive understanding of policies and procedures through some form of training or education. Also, the chain of command theoretically provides levels of management and supervision to direct the activities of subordinates toward conformity with agency rules and regulations.

Training, education, and supervision in the ideal organization also serve to socialize staff to conform to the official or approved organizational culture (see Chapter 9 on occupational socialization). A common state of affairs among organizations, however, is that mission, policies, and procedures evolve and accumulate in an unsystematic manner. New policies are created to deal with problems as they arise, and old policies and procedures are rarely reviewed, changed, or
eliminated. Under these conditions, a legitimate or useful set of written policies and procedures may not exist. Moreover, policy and procedures manuals may gather dust, and the activities of agency members are based instead upon how “it’s always been done”—or on well-established organizational routines.

Dominant values and guiding principles of agency members will be based upon unwritten but well-known organizational traditions as well as the values and beliefs imported by individual staff.

Another consideration is the scope and detailed nature of policies and procedures. This consideration is a function of the overall structure of an organization, as well as its management philosophy. As discussed, agencies may form as bureaucracies or as professional or open systems. Large criminal justice agencies such as big city police departments, county sheriff systems in large counties, and state and federal correctional and law enforcement agencies tend to take on bureaucratic structures.

These agencies develop comprehensive and detailed policy and procedures manuals and provide intensive training to increase the likelihood that staff activities will conform to desired agency rules and regulations. For criminal justice agencies in general, written policies and procedures and the expectation of staff conformity to them have taken on added significance in the last two decades. Civil suits against criminal justice agencies, especially corrections and law enforcement agencies, have become a rather common occurrence. Individuals who believe they have been harmed as a result of being involved with criminal justice agencies as suspects, offenders, inmates, victims of crime, or employees readily sue agencies to redress their perceived damages. Civil litigation almost always begins with a review of agency written policies and procedures. The first test is whether agency policies and procedures conform to applicable statutory and administrative law and general constitutional requirements. The second test asks if policies and procedures prescribe “sound” practice for the staff based upon current standards for the field. Given the first two tests, the third general test asks to what extent staff is conforming to prescribed policies and procedures. Also, to the extent staff does not follow policies and procedures, it asks to what extent failure to follow policies and procedures is a function of faulty training and/or supervision. Other questions and issues impact civil suits. The significant point here is the importance for criminal justice agencies of developing a mission statement as well as policies and procedures in a deliberate, planned manner. Moreover, agencies need to be reasonably certain that official policies and procedures will usually be followed by staff, especially in high-risk activities.

INFORMAL STRUCTURES IN ORGANIZATIONS

So far we have discussed the formal or official side of organizations—that is, the purpose, structure, and activities of an organization desired by top management and as it usually appears on paper. An informal side also develops in almost all organizations.
By informal structure, we are referring to goals, activities, or structures that are not officially acknowledged. An organization’s informal structure differs to a greater or lesser extent from its formal structure depending upon the ability of top administrators to control the behaviors of staff and/or the extent to which staff buys into the organization’s mission, policies and procedures, and desired culture, if one is articulated.

As a complicating factor, the informal structure is also a product or manifestation of an organization’s actual culture. We will describe here a number of informal organizational phenomena. Almost all agencies have a formal communications system. In hierarchical systems, official communications flow upward and downward through the chain of command (blame, of course, always flows downward). Communicating through the chain of command, however, can be inefficient and ineffective, as we will see in Chapter 4. Also, the original source of messages is readily identifiable. As a result, every organization has a robust and often intractable communication network often referred to as the rumor mill or grapevine. Information, usually not verified but often credible, moves with speed vertically, laterally, and across working units. It can easily be argued that subjective evaluation of the performance or worth of a criminal justice practitioner begins and ends with information distributed through the informal communications network.

Almost all organizations develop informal work groups in which individuals work as loosely knit teams on an ad hoc or ongoing basis. The work groups may be comprised of members of different components of an agency and different levels of its hierarchy. Informal work groups may be productive if they are working toward organizational goals and following sanctioned organizational means. Informal groups can also be considered productive even in the case where groups circumvent the organization’s sanctioned means while pursuing organizational goals. Van Zelst (1952) and Long (1984) point out that productivity can increase with the development of informal work groups. Court systems function based upon informal work groups rather than formally structured work systems (Neubauer, 1983). Informal work groups, however, can become completely aberrant and utilize the legitimacy and resources of the organization to pursue group goals and ignore legitimate means. An extreme example of this phenomenon is displayed in the well-known book and movie Serpico, describing a group of New York City police officers who became corrupt, pocketing money from the drug trade for themselves and only minimally pursuing organizational goals.

Informal leadership also emerges in organizations. Informal leaders are organizational members who do not have formal authority vested in them by rank or supervisory status but who have developed sufficient power to routinely influence other members. Informal leaders are typically individuals who are perceived as having a great deal of knowledge and expertise about the organization and its business and typically have above-average communication skills (see Chapter 77 on leadership and Chapter 10 on power). Moreover, as informal work groups form, informal leaders evolve to provide groups with direction and structure. Even among prisoners, a group subjected to intense formal structure and discipline, informal groups and leaders emerge to meet their particular needs.
Research on prisons has described the emergence of informal leaders among prisoners who contribute to the order maintenance goal of correctional institutions (see Stojkovic and Lovell, 1997).

The emergence and perpetuation of informal structures within organizations are explained to a great extent by the process of socialization within organizations. Individuals are socialized into the culture of an organization by formal, or sanctioned, and informal means (see Chapter 99 on occupational socialization). The development of a culture within an organization dictates to a great extent the values, attitudes, and behaviors of its members. Through the mechanisms of recruiting, training, and supervision provided by their formal structure, organizations attempt to impose a set of attitudes, values, and behaviors on their members. However, a degree of leakage of power exists in most organizations, especially large systems. As a result, the culture of an organization is based to some degree on the values and preferences of its members. Hence, the organization’s formal structure provides the framework for the emergence and establishment of its informal structure.

**ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMES**

Bolman and Deal (2003) argue that organizations can be conceptualized as being composed of four frames: the *structural frame*, *human resource frame*, *political frame*, and the *symbolic frame*. Thinking about organizations with the four frames allows analysis to become more discrete than does considering only formal and informal structures. Each frame describes significant attributes of organizations and encompasses considerations that apply to both formal and informal structures of organizations. The authors suggest that understanding the four frames provides paths to understanding and locating root sources of organizational problems, guides planners and change agents, and is significant to management and leadership. The frames are described with some detail below.

The *structural frame* has been discussed throughout this chapter. Structure refers to the organizational hierarchy, division of labor, job descriptions, mission, policies and procedures, etc. The key assumptions underlying the structural frame are organizations exist to achieve goals and objectives, productivity is enhanced through task specialization and the division of labor, and managerial control of staff and units is necessary to affect coordinated efforts. In addition, it is assumed that organizational rationality prevails over personal preferences and organizational structures are designed to fit the organization’s needs. Finally, problems and failures to meet goals and objectives can be remedied through altering aspects of the organization’s structure. In other words, problems and shortcomings can be remedied by altering the hierarchy, division of labor, job descriptions and task assignments, and changing the level of decision making.

The *human resource frame* assumes that organizations exist to serve human needs rather than organizational needs. People and organizations need each other. When the fit between staff and the system is poor, both suffer. When
the fit is good, individuals prosper from their experience in the organization and the organization will be successful. Most theories of motivation are based within this frame. Organizations typically develop programs and awards to meet their members’ need for recognition. Promotions based upon merit are a prime example. Also, police or corrections “officer of the month” awards are common tools for providing recognition. Criminal justice bureaucracies that are paramilitary in structure are often criticized for lacking the ability to motivate staff and for suppressing motivation by overmanagement or practicing excessively authoritarian supervision. Recognition for successful work is often lacking, and routinized feedback to staff from the hierarchy takes place through formal evaluation procedures that often become hurdles rather than sources of legitimate recognition.

Correctional and law enforcement agencies typically screen applicants to weed out individuals who will not fit into the organization. Rigorous pre-service training programs are also required that serve to screen out individuals who presumably will not be able to cope with the problems prevalent in the work. The concept of *job design* considers changing the fit between jobs and people. Also, restructuring tasks allows staff to fulfill their need for challenges and responsibility. Restructuring a police agency from the traditional to community policing mode drastically alters the role of officers. Problems may occur when traditionally oriented police who have accommodated their needs within the old mode are asked to take on different roles, responsibilities, and activities.

Human resource issues also focus on the interpersonal dynamics that underpin staff relations, formation of cliques, networks, and subcultures. Concern for interpersonal relations always comes to light in the informal *socialization* process of criminal justice practitioners. Training and supervision are often weak attempts by the formal structure to socialize its members with its values. The inability of organizations to impact the interpersonal relations of its staff, however, allows staff to create their subcultures. This has been a particular problem with rapid recruitment of minorities and women into the male-dominated criminal justice work world. Criminal justice agencies are almost always at a loss in dealing with the interpersonal relations between traditional staff and newly recruited personnel from different races and genders.

Rather than relying on a human resource approach to deal with this crucial issue, administrators typically fall back on tools available to them in the formal structure and promulgate rules, such as banning profane language and sexually oriented humor. This approach shows their inability to form partnerships with the informal structure to deal with problems. Police agencies that want to improve relationships with citizens or enter into community policing must consider the added dimension of increasing the frequency and quality of interpersonal relationships with the general public.

The *political frame* views organizations as “arenas in which different interest groups compete for scarce resources” and problems arise because power is concentrated in the wrong places (Bolman and Deal, 1997: 14). The key assumption underpinning the political frame is that organizations are coalitions and cliques of diverse individuals and interest groups who are competing for control and resources. Significant differences of values, interests, information, and perceptions
exist among coalitions. In addition, scarce resources and enduring differences make conflict central to organizational dynamics and goals and decisions are a product of bargaining, negotiating, and competition for power among competing coalitions. Politics here consists of the application of influence and power, and it abounds in both the formal and informal structures of agencies. A clear example of the redistribution of power is the growing membership in corrections and law enforcement officer unions. The power of these groups is used primarily to extract material benefits from their employers. Unions are also concerned with working conditions and often impact policy decisions to meet that goal. They may go outside the organization, directly to the public and to political bodies to obtain legislation favorable to their membership or to impact funding or its allocation within the agency. Internally, groups and cliques form on a semipermanent or temporary basis and can influence the outcome of programs or policies. Informal leaders with no formal authority but with political clout commonly emerge among the rank and file of criminal justice agencies.

A number of studies examine the process by which corrections officers gain political power in their institutions (Jacobs, 1977; Welch, 1996; Johnson, 2002). Law enforcement officers have reportedly resisted organizational change, and successful change has depended upon the ability of the organization’s leaders to directly influence the informal structure and garner sufficient power to affect the planned changes (Skolnick and Bayley, 1986). Inmates take on political power within institutions by virtue of the cliques, gangs, and social systems they form, and often corrections officers must utilize the power of the inmates to manage their institutions (Kalinich and Stojkovic, 1985). Administrators who rely solely on the tools of the formal structure to control political power will ultimately be rendered ineffective. During the bombardment of demands for civil and constitutional rights for inmates, for example, corrections officers passively resisted the change and retreated to the walls of the institutions.

The symbolic frame views organizations as tribes, theater, or carnivals in which an organization’s culture is driven by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, and myths rather than by rules or managerial authority. Problems arise when “actors play out their parts badly, when symbols lose their meaning and rituals lose their potency” (Bolman and Deal, 1997:14). For the symbolic frame, it is assumed that the meaning attached to activity is more important than what actually happens, and events have multiple meaning. Also when organizational members are faced with uncertainty and ambiguity, the members create symbols and metaphors to explain away ambiguity. Ultimately, symbols help individuals find meaning and certainty and bind organizational members together. One could argue that the criminal justice system is designed to put on major dramatic performances for the public. Uniforms and artifacts of authority are worn by judges, police, and corrections officers to display the role and power of the actors in the criminal justice theater. This display of righteous authority and power is intended to frighten thieves and cutthroats and reassure the citizenry that they are safe from the criminal element, protected by the system’s players.

The notion of deterrence requires a rather dramatic announcement of the punishment received by the wrongdoers. Manning (1997) suggests that drama
touched every aspect of police work and the public theater serves to give a picture of an ordered and controlled system, while the backstage drama serves to protect the clandestine nature of police work. Crank and Langworthy (1992) and Kalinich, Lorinskas, and Banas (1985) further argue that myth and symbols are instinctively invoked by criminal justice organizations to protect their agencies’ boundaries from intrusion by powerful constituents. The drama paradigm would suggest capital punishment may be favored by those that require a high level of drama be evoked by the system.

Race and gender stereotyping along with scathing labeling of offenders may serve to keep everyone working from the same theatrical script or, from an organizational paradigm, providing role/task clarification.

The number and popularity of cops-and-robbers television programs is indicative of the drama expected from the criminal justice work world. This drama is also often represented by folklore, war stories that represent the players’ beliefs either about their tasks/roles or the roles in which they would like to be cast. The “war” on crime and on drugs is an example of evoking symbols that cast the tasks/roles of actors as dramatic, heroic, dangerous, and important. The extent to which the public gives law enforcement officers greater status than corrections officers may lie in the visibility of police drama. Prison drama, in contrast, is hidden behind prison walls though the prison walls alone may evoke a symbol sufficient to appease the audience.

Danger and terror are distinct possibilities for criminal justice players, but a great deal of their drama consists of mundane and often boring activities, for which exciting folklore and drama cannot be easily produced. And the actors often resent being reminded of the mundane and boring aspects of their work for fear that their heroic image will become tarnished. The vision of correctional reformers for a system focusing on treatment and reintegration of criminal offenders was destroyed in the early 1970s, when rehabilitation as a symbolic statement representing the role of correctional institutions lost its effectiveness. Ironically, both political liberals and conservatives opposed rehabilitation because the symbol and its accompanying rhetoric dramatized a profoundly disparate set of evils for each group (Travis, Latessa, and Vito, 1985).

The formal structure builds the stage and organizes the theater. Managers may see that the scripts are played out correctly in the informal structure. Leaders attempt to alter the script. But the question remains: Who writes the script?

**SUMMARY**

Organizations are complex, ambiguous and difficult to understand. Information within organizations is typically incomplete, unreliable, and subject to multiple interpretations. Goals can be unclear and conflicting and individual needs are often in conflict with organizational needs. Roles and responsibility for tasks can be unclear and resources and time are always scarce. Organizational members will disagree on how to achieve goals and are never sure on how to determine
criteria for success or how to measure outcomes (Bolmen and Deal, 2003). Often there is a considerable gap between an organization’s official goals, practices, rules and desired outcomes and its operational—or actual—goals, practices rules, and observable outcomes. Understanding the source of this gap is not always easy. It is the role of individuals who study and manage organizations to understand organizations with enough precision to close the gap. The purpose of this chapter is to give the student an overview of the formal structure of organizations, as well as a glimpse at the forces that can confound the intention and purpose of that structure and process. To that end, this chapter provides an overview of the elements of the formal structure of organizations and touches briefly on the emergence of informal structures, as well as the forces in the organization that may support or confound the purpose of the organization. As Barnard (1938) points out, the formal and informal states of organizations exist simultaneously as a natural state; the informal structure is the oil that keeps the organizational machine running smoothly. Barnard suggests that the administrator’s role is to form a working partnership between the formal and informal structures of an agency, a wise piece of advice to administrators that is often lost. Downs (1967), for example, describes a cycle common to bureaucracies in which administrators, fearing erosion of control, add mechanisms and resources to the agency in order to strengthen control. Agency members soon find ways and means to circumvent the new set of control mechanisms; and administrators respond with more control efforts, using more agency resources. This practice is antithetical to the principle of forming a partnership between the informal and formal structures of an organization.

Criminal justice agencies typically work diligently at controlling the informal structure of their organizations through formal socialization of members and enforcement of official policies and procedures. Beyond such common and accepted approaches, special offices to investigate critical deviations from mandated practices are often created. An internal investigation bureau per se is appropriate for this purpose. If the zeal of administrators to impose control is strong, however, a breach between the formal and informal sides of an organization will likely be created and will be manifested in passive behavior from personnel, who will delegate minor problems and situations upward. Moreover, an informal “code of silence” among line personnel will be invoked within the informal organizational structure. Managers and students of organizations should work with a holistic frame of reference and consider the power and needs of the staff, as well as of external constituents, to better understand how to create more effective agencies. A simple understanding of organizations with the skeletal features of structure, policy and procedures, etc., is insufficient. Historically, management and leadership literature has, by implication, addressed Barnard’s administrative prescription to build a partnership between the formal and informal structures of organizations. Staff at all levels of the organization participate one way or another. The prescription that seems evident is to invite personnel into the decision-making process as a means of building a bridge between the formal and informal structures as Barnard admonished. Forming this partnership by involving subordinates in decision making at every level softens the notion of subordination of personnel and stimulates their sense of ownership and empowerment.
CASE STUDY  Integrating Professional Staff into a Bureaucratic Structure

In a recent federal district court decision, the court ordered the Department of Corrections in the State of Chaos to add a large number of mental health professionals to its present prison staff. The judges reasoned that mentally ill inmates in the Chaos Department of Corrections (CDC) were suffering what was tantamount to "cruel and unusual punishment" due to the lack of reasonable and adequate treatment for their medical/mental health conditions. To rectify the Eighth Amendment violation, the court ordered the prison system to hire 450 professional mental health workers as a crucial aspect of providing adequate treatment to the mentally ill inmates. The CDC had to resolve a number of issues in order to comply with the court order. First, a budget had to be provided to hire, train, and pay the new mental health staff. Most likely this budget would be from new state monies as the correctional officers are under the protection of a strong union, the Chaos Correctional Officers Association. As a result, the funds would not likely be transferred from the custody budget into the medical budget. Therefore, the real problem would be to fully integrate the 450 new mental health workers into the system. This integration was especially problematic as there was a long-standing conflict between custodial staff and treatment staff. The 450 new mental health workers would more than triple the number of mental health employees in the system. Hence, organizational structure issues had to be considered in order to integrate the newly expanded mental health complement into the organization.

To best utilize and integrate the new staff, the director of Corrections called for a warden's roundtable discussion to map out a plan. The director was well aware of the general causes of the treatment–custody conflict. First, it was a question of authority. In the past, treatment personnel conflicted with correctional officers over decisions on issues of inmate management, such as classification of punishment. In this regard, correctional officers assumed that they would ultimately be held responsible for the overall control of inmates and that treatment staff usually rated the care function of corrections above the need to keep order. Second, there was always an undertone of social class difference between educated treatment staff and correctional officers, who often had a community college degree or less. Third, the long-standing tradition of conflict between custody and treatment personnel made it difficult for the two groups to compromise and to develop working relationships. These crucial issues notwithstanding, the director reasoned that the first step was to reconsider and redesign if necessary the system's organizational structure. The director of Corrections decided to lay out an agenda for the meeting to keep it from becoming a free-for-all and to keep it focused on the organizational structure.

Case Study Questions
1. Using the chapter as a guide, create an agenda for this meeting. Explain your choices.
2. In your opinion, can the treatment personnel be structured as a professional organization and work successfully alongside the correctional officers, who work in a paramilitary bureaucracy?
3. To what extent do treatment personnel and correctional officers make similar or different decisions? Should members of each group have the same latitude of discretion in making decisions?
4. Should members of both groups be governed by policies and procedures written by personnel in the director's office and warden's office? Should the treatment staff have input into the policies and procedures that govern their activities? Do you have any other suggestions in this area? Explain your answer.
5. Under what circumstances and conditions can a "team" approach between mental health and custody staff work?

FOR DISCUSSION

1. Identify the impediments to altering the structure of a large criminal justice agency. Take into account all of the issues involved with organizational structure.
2. What steps should an administrator take to build a partnership between the agency’s formal and informal structures? In your opinion, what role, if any, do leaders of the informal structure have in building such a relationship?

**FOR FURTHER READING**


